

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03925 01 OF 02 251806Z

45

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 INRE-00 NSCE-00

ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 NSC-05 USIE-00 /082 W  
----- 071449

O R 251555Z JUL 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2871

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY BONN

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3925

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC DISCUSSION JULY 24

REFS: A) USNATO 3867 DTG 221810Z JUL 75; B) USNATO 3868 DTG 221825Z  
JUL 75

SUMMARY: SPC MADE PROGRESS TOWARDS AGREED OBJECTIVE OF FULLY BRACKETED

TEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENT. INTERNATIONAL STAFF WILL DRAFT  
ALTERNATIVES TO PARA 3 OF THE US DRAFT OF THE SUPPLEMENT IN  
LIGHT OF FRG AND UK APPROACHES TO COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING (CCC).  
PARAGRAPHS 5-8 OF THE US DRAFT SUPPLEMENT WERE TENTATIVELY AGREED  
WITHOUT CHANGE. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF PARAS 9-15 OF US DRAFT  
REVEALED NO MAJOR PROBLEMS EXCEPT BELGIAN DESIRE TO TAKE  
OPENING POSITION THAT NO REPEAT NO ARMAMENTS CEILINGS ARE  
NECESSARY OR DESIRABLE. DISCUSSION OF PARAS 1-3 OF DRAFT  
GUIDANCE REVEALED SOME PROGRESS TOWARDS AGREEMENT, BUT FAILED  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03925 01 OF 02 251806Z

TO REMOVE BRACKETS. END SUMMARY.

1. DEFINITION OF CCC. DISCUSSION OF FRG PAPER (TEXT REF A) TOOK  
PLACE IN CONTEXT OF AGREEMENT TO CHAIRMAN'S (PABSCH) REMINDER THAT

THE OBJECTIVE WAS TO ARRIVE AT A BRACKETED VERSION OF PARA 3 OF THE US DRAFT SUPPLEMENT. UK REP (RICHARDS), COMMENTING ON FRG PAPER, NOTED THAT UK DID NOT OBJECT IN PRINCIPLE TO GIVING THE AHG SOME TACTICAL FLEXIBILITY, AND ADDED THAT SINCE THE ALLIES HAD ALREADY GIVEN THE ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURE OF 700,000, IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO MENTION THIS FIGURE (OR 900,000) IN SOME WAY WHILE DEMANDING THE CCC.

2. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) TOOK THE VIEW THAT A NUMERICAL LEVEL FOR THE CCC SHOULD NOT BE SET UNTIL AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THE DATA/DEFINITIONS DISCUSSION WITH THE EAST, BUT IN PRINCIPLE SHOULD STILL BE SET IN PHASE I AGREEMENT, EVEN IF THE ALLIES DID NOT HAVE A FIGURE TO PROPOSE UNTIL MUCH LATER. BELGIAN REP ALSO STATED FEAR THAT FRG ALTERNATIVE TO AGREEING ON A FIGURE (PARA 10, REF A) WOULD LEAVE THE ALLIES VULNERABLE TO EASTERN PRESSURE IN PHASE II TO TAKE LARGER REDUCTIONS THAN ALLIES WISHED.

3. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) FELT THIS RISK WAS SMALL, SINCE THAT WOULD ALSO REQUIRE EASTERN REDUCTIONS LARGER THAN EAST WOULD WISH. FRG REP (HOYNCK) AGREED THAT THIS RISK EXISTED, AND SAID THAT ALLIES WOULD HAVE TWO "EMERGENCY BRAKES" TO AVERT IT: INTERNAL ALLIED AGREEMENT ON THE LEVEL OF THE CCC, AND MENTION OF THE ILLUSTRATIVE NUMBER IN SOME WAY IN THE AGREEMENT. US REP (PEREZ) REMARKED THAT THE STATE OF THE DATA/DEFINITIONDISCUSSION PROVIDED A FURTHER REASON TO DEFER AN ALLIED DECISION ON WHETHER TO SPECIFY THE CCC NUMERICALLY, AND THAT THE EASTERN DESIRE FOR EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS WOULD GIVE THE ALLIES ADEQUATE BARGAINING LEVERAGE IN PHASE II. FRG REP SAID THAT IF THE ALLIES COULD GET A NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I, THEY SHOULD DO SO. HOWEVER, HE AGREED WITH THOSE WHO SAID IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO DO SO. IF, AS BELGIAN REP SAID, THE ALLIES COULD LEAVE AGREEMENT ON A NUMERICAL CCC UNTIL LATE IN PHASE I, THEY COULD LEAVE IT UNTIL PHASE II AS PARA 10 OF FRG PAPER PROVIDED.

4. IT WAS AGREED THAT THE IS DRAFT WILL CONTAIN THREE ALTERNATIVE  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03925 01 OF 02 251806Z

APPROACHES: THE US APPROACH; THE UK APPROACH OF DEMANDING AGREEMENT ON A NUMERICAL LEVEL FOR THE CCC AT TIME OPTION III IS TABLED; AND FRG ALTERNATIVE. FRG REP THEN SPECIFIED FOUR KEY ASPECTS OF FRG ALTERNATIVE: (A) EAST-WEST UNDERSTANDING DURING PHASE I ON THE POST-PHASE I DATA BASE; (B) EAST-WEST UNDERSTANDING DURING PHASE I THAT THE COMMON CEILING WOULD BE COLLECTIVE, AND WOULD BE REACHED BY COLLECTIVE REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS; (C) ALLIED AGREEMENT ON THE CCC LEVEL; (D) AN ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURE FOR THE CCC--WHICH NEED NOT BE THE SAME NUMBER AS THE ONE IN THE INTERNAL ALLIED AGREEMENT--WOULD BE CONTAINED IN THE EAST-WEST PHASE I AGREEMENT. UK REP NOTED THAT IN ANY EVENT THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD CONTAIN AN ALLIED AGREEMENT ON WHAT DATA MUST BE AGREED WITH THE EAST DURING PHASE I.

5. SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER--REDUCTIONS. THE FRG CIRCULATED AN ADDITIONAL PARAGRAPH WHICH THEY PROPOSE INSERTING IMMEDIATELY BEFORE PARA 4 OF THE US DRAFT. IT WAS NOT DISCUSSED IN SUBSTANCE; BELGIAN REP PROPOSED INSERTING "OR AIR" AFTER "NUCLEAR" IN SECOND TIC. BEGIN FRG TEXT:

THE ALLIES AGREE THAT:

- OPTION III CONTAINS ONLY US ELEMENTS,
- FURTHER REDUCTIONS OF NUCLEAR ELEMENTS IN THE FIRST OR SECOND PHASE ARE EXCLUDED.
- NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT WILL NOT BE REDUCED EITHER IN PHASE I OR IN PHASE II.
- THE FOCUS ON PERSONNEL WILL BE MAINTAINED. END FRG TEXT.

6. ITALIAN REP (CIARRAPICO) NOTED THAT THERE IS A CONTINUING ITALIAN RESERVATION ON THE WHOLE PROJECT, SINCE THE ITALIANS DOUBT THE WISDOM OF REDUCING EITHER F-4S OR PERSHING. (NOTE: ITALIANS HAD NOT SAID THIS BEFORE.) HE DID NOT, HOWEVER, BRACKET PARA 4 OF THE US DRAFT SUPPLEMENT. WHEN BELGIAN AND DUTCH REPS PRESSED FOR THE REASON FOR THIS STATEMENT, HE WAS UNABLE TO REPLY.

7. ON PARAS 5-8 OF US DRAFT OF SUPPLEMENT, FRG REP COMMENTED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES HAD NO PROBLEMS AT FIRST GLANCE, ALTHOUGH THIS APPROVAL WAS STILL TENTATIVE. UK REP SAID THAT ONLY CHANGE HIS AUTHORITIES DESIRED WAS INSERTION OF A NEW PARAGRAPH BETWEEN 6 AND 7, WHICH HE CIRCULATED. IT WAS NOT DISCUSSED.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03925 01 OF 02 251806Z

BEGIN UK TEXT: 6A US MANPOWER REDUCTIONS. THE ALLIED PROPOSAL FOR THE WITHDRAWAL UNDER A PHASE I AGREEMENT OF 29,000 US SOLDIERS REMAINS UNCHANGED. END UK TEXT.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03925 02 OF 02 251839Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /088 W  
----- 072106

O R 251555Z JUL 75  
FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2872  
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3925

8. SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER--LIMITATION. FRG REP RAISED THE UK SUGGESTION (IN UK PAPER, TEXT REF B, PARA 14) OF A COMMON CEILING ON US AND SOVIET TANKS, SAYING THAT WHILE THIS WAS AN ATTRACTIVE IDEA IT GAVE TOO MUCH WEIGHT TO ARMAMENTS CEILINGS. THE ESSENTIAL PURPOSE OF ANY CATEGORIZATION SYSTEM IS TO DISTINGUISH CLEARLY BETWEEN SYSTEMS ON WHICH WE CAN ACCEPT LIMITS AND EUROPEAN SYSTEMS ON WHICH WE CANNOT. A BETTER APPROACH MIGHT BE TO SEEK CEILINGS ON (A) SYSTEMS REDUCED AND (B) RECIPROCAL ELEMENTS. NETHERLANDS AND BELGIAN REPS OPPOSED UK PROPOSAL ON GROUNDS THAT IT WAS UNREALISTIC. BELGIAN REP MADE PRESENTATION OF SOME 30-45 MINUTES ON THE VIRTUES OF PROPOSING INITIALLY THAT THERE BE NO ARMAMENTS LIMITATION WHATEVER, AND THEN FALLING BACK UNDER EASTERN PRESSURE TO POSITION IN US PAPER. HIS OBJECTION TO US APPROACH IS THAT IT OFFERS NO ROOM FOR SAFE FALLBACKS, AND FALLBACKS OF SOME SORT ARE INEVITABLE. HERECEIVED NO SUPPORT.

9. FRG REP OFFERED FOLLOWING PROPOSED CHANGES TO US PAPER, APART  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03925 02 OF 02 251839Z

FROM THE INSERTION OF A NEW PARA BETWEEN 3 AND 4 DESCRIBED ABOVE:

A. ADDITION OF THE FOLLOWING NEW SENTENCE TO THE END OF  
PARA 1: "THE VIEWS CONTAINED IN THE GUIDANCE TO THE AHG ARE  
PART OF THE ALLIED POSITION ON OPTION III."

B. BRACKETS AROUND THE THIRD SENTENCE IN PARA 11 ("ALLIES  
WOULD WANT THE NEGOTIATING RECORD TO REFLECT IN SOME WAY  
THE MODELS COVERED BY THE LIMITATION.") SINCE THIS THOUGHT  
SHOULD BE MADE MORE PRECISE.

C. IN THE OPENING WORDS OF PARA 18, CHANGE "THE ALLIES  
SHOULD NOT ACCEPT LIMITATION..." TO "THE ALLIES AGREE NOT TO  
ACCEPT LIMITATION..."

D. BRACKETS AROUND ALL OF PARA 20 (ON AIR MANPOWER) UNTIL  
THE ENTIRE ISSUE CAN BE DISCUSSED AND RESOLVED.

10. DRAFT GUIDANCE. A DISCUSSION OF PARAS 1 AND 3 OF THE DRAFT  
GUIDANCE FAILED TO REMOVE BRACKETS. FRG REP HAD INSTRUCTIONS  
TO REJECT COMPROMISE ON SECOND CHAPEAU IN PARA 1, AND SUGGESTED  
THAT THIS ISSUE BE ALLOWED TO "RIPEN" FOR A WHILE. UK REP  
HAD INSTRUCTIONS ON PARA 3 WHICH FAILED TO REFLECT EARLIER  
DISCUSSION, AND AGREED TO RECOMMEND THAT THEY BE CHANGED.  
FRG REP COULD ACCEPT PHRASE "UNIQUE TRADE" IN PARA 3 IF US  
WOULD ACCEPT LANGUAGE THAT NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON

"GROUND FORCE MANPOWER" RATHER THAN "GROUND FORCES," AND HERE ALSO FRG REP SUGGESTED THAT GIVEN TIME HIS INSTRUCTIONS WOULD BECOME MORE FORTHCOMING. US REP REITERATED US HOPE THAT THOSE COUNTRIES WHICH HAD BEEN CONCERNED ABOUT LANGUAGE, NOW DROPPED, ON THREATENING ELEMENTS OR ELEMENTS OF EXPRESSED CONCERN TO BOTH SIDES, COULD NOT ACCEPT THE "UNIQUE TRADE" REFERENCE.

11. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) NOTED THAT HE HAD INSTRUCTIONS TO BRACKET THE FINAL TIC IN PARA 5 OF THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE (" THE SOVIETS WOULD NOT INCREASE THEIR NUCLEAR ELEMENTS ANALOGOUS TO THOSE WITHDRAWN BY THE US IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO UNDERMINE THE BASIS OF THE AGREEMENT.") ON THE GROUNDS THAT THIS MUST BE MADE MORE PRECISE.

12. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE.

13. NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT IN LIGHT OF THE US DRAFT SUPPLEMENT AND EXPLANATION BY US REP, THE DUTCH NOW UNDERSTOOD  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03925 02 OF 02 251839Z

AND AGREED WITH WHAT US INTENDED BY WITHDRAWAL OF A SOVIET TANK ARMY. (COMMENT: WE NOTE THAT PARA 3 OF THE US SUPPLEMENT SAYS THE SOVIETS "MUST AGREE" TO WITHDRAW A TANK ARMY, PARA 7 SAYS THEY "SHOULD" DO SO, AND PARA 13 SAYS THEY "WOULD BE EXPECTED" TO DO SO. WE ARE PREPARED TO AGREE TO "MUST" IN EACH CASE IF OTHER ALLIES WISH.)

14. ACTION REQUESTED: NEXT SPC MEETING WILL BE MONDAY, JULY 28. IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO RECEIVE GUIDANCE ON AS MANY OF THE FOLLOWING ALLIED PROPOSALS AS POSSIBLE:

A. SUBSTANCE OF FRG ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO DEFINING CCC, AS CLARIFIED IN PARA 4 ABOVE.

B. UK PROPOSAL THAT ALLIES AGREE ON WHAT DATA MUST BE AGREED IN PHASE I.

C. FRG PARA FOR SUPPLEMENT CONTAINED IN PARA 5 ABOVE.

D. UK PARA FOR SUPPLEMENT CONTAINED IN PARA 7 ABOVE.

E. FRG AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT SUPPLEMENT CONTAINED IN PARA 9, SUBPARAS A AND C, ABOVE.

F. FRG DESIRE FOR GREATER PRECISION IN HOW NEGOTIATING RECORD WOULD REFLECT AIRCRAFT MODELS COVERED BY NUCLEAR-CAPABLE DEFINITION.

G. NETHERLANDS DESIRE (SHARED BY UK AND FRG) FOR GREATER PRECISION IN DEFINING WHAT SOVIET NUCLEAR INCREASES WOULD BE PROHIBITED. BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 25 JUL 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** greeneet  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO03925  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzleo.tel  
**Line Count:** 266  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A) USNATO 3867 DTG 221810Z JUL 75; B) USNATO 3868 DTG 221825Z JUL 75  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** greeneet  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 03 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <03 APR 2003 by lzenbel0>; APPROVED <06 OCT 2003 by greeneet>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: OPTION III: SPC DISCUSSION JULY 24  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
LONDON  
BONN  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006